

MARKOV CHAIN APPROXIMATIONS FOR TRANSITION DENSITIES OF LÉVY PROCESSES

ALEKSANDAR MIJATOVIĆ, MATIJA VIDMAR, AND SAUL JACKA

ABSTRACT. We consider the convergence of a continuous-time Markov chain approximation X^h , $h > 0$, to an $\mathbb{R}$ -valued Lévy process X . The state space of X^h is an equidistant lattice and its Q -matrix is chosen to approximate the generator of X . Under a general sufficient condition for the existence of transition densities of X , we establish sharp convergence rates of the normalised probability mass function of X^h to the probability density function of X .

1. INTRODUCTION

Discretization schemes for stochastic processes are relevant both theoretically, as they shed light on the nature of the underlying stochasticity, and practically, since they lend themselves well to numerical methods. Indeed, there has been a plethora of publications devoted to the subject, see e.g. [9], and with regard to the pricing of financial derivatives [7] and the references therein.

Lévy processes, in particular, constitute a rich and fundamental class with applications in diverse areas such as mathematical finance, risk management, insurance, queuing, storage and population genetics (see e.g. [10]). There is a wealth of existing literature concerning approximations of Lévy processes in one form or another and a brief overview of simulation techniques is given by [13]. In continuous time [8] approximates by replacing the small jumps part by a diffusion, and discusses also rates of convergence for $\mathbb{E}[g \circ X_T]$, where g is real-valued and satisfies certain integrability conditions, T is a fixed time and X the process under approximation; [5] approximates by a combination of Brownian motion and sums of compound Poisson processes with two-sided exponential densities. In discrete time, Markov chains have been used to approximate the much larger class of Feller processes and [3] proves convergence in law of such an approximation in the Skorohod space of càdlàg paths, but does not discuss rates of convergence; [15] has a finite state-space path approximation and applies this to option pricing together with a discussion of the rates of convergence for the prices.

This paper studies the rate of convergence of a weak approximation of a Lévy process X by a continuous-time Markov chain (CTMC). Our main result, Theorem 2, establishes the precise convergence rates of the normalised probability mass functions of the approximating Markov chains

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G51.

Key words and phrases. Lévy process, continuous-time Markov chain, spectral representation, convergence rates for semi-groups and transition densities.

MV acknowledges the support of the Slovene Human Resources Development and Scholarship Fund under contract number 11010-543/2011.

to the transition densities of the Lévy process for the two proposed discretisation schemes, one in the case where X has a non-trivial diffusion component and one when it does not. More precisely, in both cases we approximate X by a CTMC X^h with state space $\mathbb{Z}_h := h\mathbb{Z}$ and Q -matrix defined as a natural discretised version of the generator of X . This makes the CTMC X^h into a continuous-time random walk, which is skip-free (i.e. simple) if X is without jumps (i.e. Brownian motion with drift). The quantity

$$\kappa(h) := \int_{[-1,1] \setminus [-h,h]} |x| d\lambda(x),$$

where λ is the Lévy measure of X , is related to the activity of the small jumps of X and plays a crucial role in the rate of convergence. We assume that either the diffusion component of X is present ($\sigma^2 > 0$) or the jump activity of X is sufficient (Orey's condition [14, Prop. 28.3], see also Assumption 1 below) to ensure that X admits continuous transition densities $p_{t,T}(x,y)$ (from x at time t to y at time $T > t$). Let $P_{t,T}^h(x,y) := \mathbb{P}(X_T^h = y | X_t^h = x)$ denote the corresponding transition probabilities of X^h and let

$$\Delta_{T-t}(h) := \sup_{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}_h} \left| p_{t,T}(x,y) - \frac{1}{h} P_{t,T}^h(x,y) \right|.$$

The following table summarizes our result (here for functions $f \geq 0$ and $g > 0$, we write $f = O(g)$ for $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} f(h)/g(h) < \infty$ — if g converges to 0, we say f decays no slower than g):

$\Delta_{T-t}(h)$	$\sigma^2 > 0$	$\sigma^2 = 0$
$\lambda(\mathbb{R}) = 0$	$O(h^2)$	$\times$
$0 < \lambda(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$	$O(h)$	$\times$
$\lambda(\mathbb{R}) = \infty$	$O(h\kappa(h/2))$	

We also prove that the rates stated here are sharp in the sense that there exist Lévy processes for which convergence is no better than stated.

The rate of convergence depends on the Lévy measure λ only in the case when X has infinite activity jumps. If X is a compound Poisson process (i.e. $\lambda(\mathbb{R}) \in (0, \infty)$) without a diffusion component, there is always an atom at zero and hence the convergence is studied only in the case $\sigma^2 > 0$. In the infinite activity case, the definition of κ implies $\kappa(h) = o(1/h)$ (for functions $f \geq 0$ and $g > 0$, we use the notation $f = o(g)$ to mean $\lim_{h \downarrow 0} f(h)/g(h) = 0$ — if g converges to 0, we say f decays strictly faster than g). However the convergence of $h\kappa(h/2)$ to zero, as $h \downarrow 0$, can be arbitrarily slow.

We point out that a result, which is less explicit, but similar in spirit to ours, is to be found in [1] for solutions to SDEs: for the case of the Euler approximation scheme, the authors there also study the rate of convergence of the transition densities.

The proof of Theorem 2 is in two steps: we first establish the convergence rates of the characteristic exponents (Subsection 3.2) of X_t and X_t^h . In the second step we apply these to study the convergence of the transition densities (Section 4) via their spectral representations (established in Subsection 3.1). Note that in general the rates of convergence of the characteristic functions do

not carry over directly to the distribution functions. We are able to follow through the above programme by exploiting the special structure of the infinitely divisible distributions in what amounts to a detailed comparison of the transition kernels $p_{t,T}(x, y)$ and $P_{t,T}^h(x, y)$.

By way of example, note that if $\lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h, h]) \sim 1/h^{1+\alpha}$ for some $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, then $\kappa(h) \sim h^{-\alpha}$ and the convergence of the normalized probability mass function to the transition density is by Theorem 2 of order $h^{1-\alpha}$, since $\kappa(0) = \infty$ and Orey's condition is satisfied (we use the notation $f \sim g$ to mean $\lim_{h \downarrow 0} f(h)/g(h) \in (0, \infty)$). In particular, in the case of the CGMY [4] (tempered stable) or β -stable [14, p. 80] processes with stability parameter $\beta \in (1, 2)$, we have $\alpha = \beta - 1$ and hence the convergence of order $h^{2-\beta}$.

Observe also that in terms of pricing theory, the probability density function of a process can be viewed as the Arrow-Debreu state price, i.e. the current value of an option whose payoff equals the Dirac delta function. The singular nature of this payoff makes it hard, particularly in the presence of jumps, to study the convergence of the prices under the discretised process to its continuous counterpart. Theorem 2 can be viewed as generalisation of such convergence results for the well-known discretisation of the Black-Scholes model (see e.g. [11] for the case of Brownian motion with drift).

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the setting by specifying the Markov generator of X^h , and precisely states the main result. In section 3 we find integral expressions for the transition kernels by applying spectral theory to the generator of the approximating chain. In section 4 this allows us to establish convergence rates for the transition densities.

2. DEFINITIONS, NOTATION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

2.1. Setting. Let $\Psi(p) := -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 p^2 + i\mu p + \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{ipx} - 1 - ipx\mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(x))d\lambda(x)$ ($p \in \mathbb{R}$) be the characteristic exponent corresponding to a Lévy process X with characteristic triplet $(\sigma^2, \lambda, \mu)_{\tilde{c}} - \tilde{c}(y) := \mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(y)$ is the cut-off function and V is 1 or 0, the latter only if $\int_{[-1, 1]} |x|d\lambda(x) < \infty$. Then X is a Markov process with transition function $P_{t,T}(x, B) := \mathbb{P}(X_{T-t} \in B - x)$ ($0 \leq t \leq T$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})$) and $\phi_{X_t}(p) = \mathbb{E}[e^{ipX_t}] = \exp\{t\Psi(p)\}$. We refer to [2, 14] for the background on Lévy processes.

Fix $h > 0$. Consider a CTMC $X^h = (X_t^h)_{t \geq 0}$ approximating our Lévy process X (in law). We describe X^h as having [12] state space $\mathbb{Z}_h := h\mathbb{Z} := \{hk : k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, initial state $X_0^h = 0$, a.s. and an infinitesimal generator L^h given by a spatially homogeneous Q -matrix Q^h (i.e. $Q_{ss'}^h$ depends only on $s - s'$, for $\{s, s'\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_h$). Thus L^h is a mapping defined on the set $l^\infty(\mathbb{Z}_h)$ of bounded functions f on $\mathbb{Z}_h$, and $L^h f(s) = \sum_{s' \in S} Q_{ss'}^h f(s')$.

It remains to specify Q^h . To this end we discretise on $\mathbb{Z}_h$ the infinitesimal generator L of the Lévy process X , thus obtaining L^h . Recall that [14, p. 208]:

$$Lf(x) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} f''(x) + \mu f'(x) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} [f(x+y) - f(x) - yf'(x)\mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(y)] d\lambda(y)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and every twice continuously differentiable $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with f, f', f'' vanishing at infinity. We thus have **discretisation scheme 1**, for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_h$ and $f : \mathbb{Z}_h \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ vanishing at infinity:

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} L^h f(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma^2 + c_0^h \right) \frac{f(s+h) + f(s-h) - 2f(s)}{h^2} + \left(\mu - \mu^h \right) \frac{f(s+h) - f(s-h)}{2h} \\ &+ \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} [f(s+s') - f(s)] c_{s'}^h \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced $c_s^h := \lambda(A_s^h)$ with $A_s^h := (s-h/2, s+h/2]$ if $s > 0$ and $A_s^h := [s-h/2, s+h/2)$ if $s < 0$ ($s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}$); finally (letting $A_0^h := [-h/2, h/2]$; $\delta^0 \in \{0, 1\}$):

$$c_0^h := \delta^0 \int_{A_0^h} y^2 \mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(y) d\lambda(y) \quad \mu^h := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} s \int_{A_s^h} \mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(y) d\lambda(y).$$

We reserve the right to set c_0^h to 0 even if $V \neq 0$, hence the presence of $\delta^0 \in \{0, 1\}$.

Note that Q^h has nonnegative off-diagonal entries for all h for which:

$$(2) \quad \frac{\sigma^2 + c_0^h}{2h^2} + \frac{\mu - \mu^h}{2h} + c_h^h \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\sigma^2 + c_0^h}{2h^2} - \frac{\mu - \mu^h}{2h} + c_{-h}^h \geq 0$$

and in that case Q^h is a genuine Q -matrix (due to spatial homogeneity, its entries are then also uniformly bounded in absolute value). When $\sigma^2 > 0$, it will be shown that (2) always obtains, at least for all sufficiently small h (see Proposition 11), but not in general. When $\sigma^2 = 0$ we shall thus employ an alternative discretisation for which the above condition holds vacuously. The changes are as follows.

First, (1) now reads (letting $\text{sgn} := \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)} - \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0)}$):

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} L^h f(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sigma^2 + c_0^h \right) \frac{f(s+h) + f(s-h) - 2f(s)}{h^2} + \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} [f(s+s' + h \text{sgn}(s')) - f(s)] c_{s'}^h + \\ &+ (\mu - \mu^h) \frac{f(s+h) - f(s)}{h} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(\mu - \mu^h) + (\mu - \mu^h) \frac{f(s) - f(s-h)}{h} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(\mu - \mu^h) \end{aligned}$$

So, in place of $(\mu - \mu^h) \frac{f(s+h) - f(s-h)}{2h}$ we have rather $(\mu - \mu^h) \frac{f(s+h) - f(s)}{h}$ or $(\mu - \mu^h) \frac{f(s) - f(s-h)}{h}$ accordingly as $\mu - \mu^h \geq 0$ or $\mu - \mu^h \leq 0$. We have also modified slightly the final summation in L^h . This will turn out to be advantageous when considering the convergence of the transition kernel with $\sigma^2 = 0$ (see the estimate in (25)) and is made solely for this purpose: it is possible that one could establish convergence rates even without this modification but our proof technique relies on it.

Second, we have:

$$\mu^h := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} (s + h \text{sgn}(s)) \int_{A_s^h} \mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(y) d\lambda(y).$$

Everything else remains unchanged. We shall refer to this as **discretisation scheme 2**. Most of our arguments will be the same under both and when it is not so, we shall make this explicit.

2.2. Summary of results. The assumption alluded to in the introduction is the following (we state it explicitly when it is being used):

Assumption 1. *Either $\sigma^2 > 0$ or Orey's condition holds:*

$$\exists \epsilon \in (0, 2) \quad \text{such that} \quad \liminf_{r \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{r^{2-\epsilon}} \int_{[-r, r]} u^2 d\lambda(u) > 0.$$

The usage of the two schemes and the specification of δ^0 and V is as summarized in Table 1 — by contrast to Assumption 1 we maintain this table as being in effect throughout this subsection.

TABLE 1. Usage of the two schemes and of δ^0 and V depending on the nature of σ^2 and λ .

Lévy measure/diffusion part	$\sigma^2 > 0$ (scheme 1)	$\sigma^2 = 0$ (scheme 2)
$\lambda(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$	$V = \delta^0 = 0$	$\times$
$\kappa(0) < \infty = \lambda(\mathbb{R})$	$V = 1$ and $\delta^0 = 0$	
$\kappa(0) = \infty$	$V = \delta^0 = 1$	

Under Assumption 1 for every $t > 0$, $\phi_{X_t} \in L^1(m)$ where m is Lebesgue measure and (for $0 \leq t < T$, $\{x, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}$):

$$(4) \quad p_{t,T}(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp\{ip(x-y)\} \exp\{\Psi(p)(T-t)\} dp.$$

Similarly, with Ψ^h denoting the characteristic exponent of the compound Poisson process X^h (for $0 \leq t < T$, $y \in \mathbb{Z}_h$, $\mathbb{P}_{X_t^h}$ -a.s. in $x \in \mathbb{Z}_h$):

$$(5) \quad \frac{1}{h} P_{t,T}^h(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{h}}^{\frac{\pi}{h}} \exp\{ip(x-y)\} \exp\{\Psi^h(p)(T-t)\} dp.$$

Note that the RHS is defined even if $\mathbb{P}(X_t^h = x) = 0$ and we let the LHS be this value when this is so. Finally, for $0 \leq t < T$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}_h$ define:

$$(6) \quad \Delta_{T-t}(h) := \sup_{\{x,y\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_h} D_{t,T}^h(x, y) \quad \text{where} \quad D_{t,T}^h(x, y) := \left| p_{t,T}(x, y) - \frac{1}{h} P_{t,T}^h(x, y) \right|.$$

The main result of the paper can now be stated.

Theorem 2 (Convergence of transition kernels). *Under Assumption 1, whenever $s > 0$, the convergence of $\Delta_s(h)$ is as summarized in the following table. In general convergence is no better than stipulated.*

$\Delta_s(h)$	$\lambda(\mathbb{R}) = 0$	$0 < \lambda(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$	$\kappa(0) < \infty = \lambda(\mathbb{R})$	$\kappa(0) = \infty$
$\sigma^2 > 0$	$O(h^2)$	$O(h)$	$O(h)$	$O(h\kappa(h/2))$
$\sigma^2 = 0$	$\times$	$\times$		

Remark 3 (Convergence in distribution). X^h converges to X weakly in finite-dimensional distributions as $h \downarrow 0$.

3. TRANSITION KERNELS AND CONVERGENCE OF THE CHARACTERISTIC EXPONENTS

3.1. Integral representations. First we note the following result (its proof is essentially by the standard inversion theorem, see also [14, p. 190]).

Remark 4. Under Assumption 1, X_t ($t > 0$) admits the continuous density $f_{X_t}(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-ipy} \phi_{X_t}(p) dp$. For some $\{P, C, \epsilon\} \subset (0, \infty)$ depending only on $\{\lambda, \sigma^2\}$ and all $p \in \mathbb{R} \setminus (-P, P)$: $|\phi_{X_t}(p)| \leq \exp\{-Ct|p|^\epsilon\}$. When $\sigma^2 > 0$, $\epsilon = 2$ and otherwise ϵ takes the value in Orey's condition in Assumption 1. In particular, the law $P_{t,T}(x, \cdot)$ is given by (4).

Second, to obtain (5) we apply some classical theory of Hilbert spaces, see e.g. [6].

Definition 5. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}_h$ let $g_s : [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be given by $g_s(p) := \sqrt{\frac{h}{2\pi}} e^{-isp}$. The $(g_s)_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h}$ constitute an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space $L^2([-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}])$.

Let $A \in l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)$. We define: $\mathcal{F}_h A := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h} A(s) g_s$. The inverse of this transform $\mathcal{F}_h^{-1} : L^2([-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}]) \rightarrow l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)$ is given by:

$$(\mathcal{F}_h^{-1} \phi)(s) = \langle \phi, g_s \rangle := \int_{[-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}]} \phi \overline{g_s} dm$$

for $\phi \in L^2([-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}])$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_h$.

Definition 6. For a bounded linear operator $A : l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h) \rightarrow l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)$, we say $F_A : [-\pi/h, \pi/h] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is its diagonalization, if $\mathcal{F}_h A \mathcal{F}_h^{-1} \phi = F_A \phi$ for all $\phi \in L^2([-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}])$.

We now diagonalize L^h , which allows us to establish (5). The straightforward proof is left to the reader.

Proposition 7. Fix $C \in l^1(\mathbb{Z}_h)$. The following introduces a number of bounded linear operators $A : l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h) \rightarrow l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)$ and gives their diagonalization. With $f \in l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_h$, $p \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}]$:

- (i) $\Delta_h f(s) := \frac{f(s+h) + f(s-h) - 2f(s)}{h^2}$. $F_{\Delta_h}(p) = 2 \frac{\cos(hp) - 1}{h^2}$.
- (ii) $\nabla_h f(s) := \frac{f(s+h) - f(s-h)}{2h}$. $F_{\nabla_h}(p) = i \frac{\sin(hp)}{h}$. Under scheme 2 we let $\nabla_h^+ f(s) := \frac{f(s+h) - f(s)}{h}$ (resp. $\nabla_h^- f(s) := \frac{f(s) - f(s-h)}{h}$) and then $F_{\nabla_h^+}(p) = \frac{e^{ihp} - 1}{h}$ (resp. $F_{\nabla_h^-}(p) = \frac{1 - e^{-ihp}}{h}$).
- (iii) $L_C f(s) := \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}_h} (f(s + s') - f(s)) C(s')$. $F_{L_C}(p) = \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h} C(s) (e^{isp} - 1)$. Under scheme 2 we let $L_C f(s) := \sum_{s' \in \mathbb{Z}_h} (f(s + s' + h \operatorname{sgn}(s')) - f(s)) C(s')$ and then $F_{L_C}(p) := \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h} C(s) (e^{i(s+h \operatorname{sgn}(s))p} - 1)$.

As λ is finite outside any neighborhood of 0, $L^h|_{l^2(\mathbb{Z}_h)}$ (as in (1), resp. (3)) is a bounded linear mapping. We denote this restriction by L^h also. Its diagonalization is then given by $\Psi^h := F_{L^h}$, where, under scheme 1,

$$(7) \quad \Psi^h(p) = i(\mu - \mu^h) \frac{\sin(hp)}{h} + (\sigma^2 + c_0^h) \frac{(\cos(hp) - 1)}{h^2} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1)$$

and under scheme 2,

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} \Psi^h(p) &= (\mu - \mu^h) \frac{e^{ihp} - 1}{h} \mathbb{1}_{[0, \infty)}(\mu - \mu^h) + (\mu - \mu^h) \frac{1 - e^{-ihp}}{h} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty, 0]}(\mu - \mu^h) \\ &+ (\sigma^2 + c_0^h) \frac{(\cos(hp) - 1)}{h^2} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h \left(e^{i(s + h \operatorname{sgn}(s))p} - 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

(with $p \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}]$, but we can and will view Ψ^h as defined for all real p by the formulae above). Under either scheme, Ψ^h is bounded and continuous as the final sum converges absolutely and uniformly.

Lemma 8. *For scheme 1 under (2) and always for scheme 2, for every $0 \leq t < T$, $y \in \mathbb{Z}_h$ and $P_{X_t^h}$ -a.s. in $x \in \mathbb{Z}_h$ (5) obtains, i.e.:*

$$P(X_T^h = y | X_t^h = x) = \frac{h}{2\pi} \int_{-\frac{\pi}{h}}^{\frac{\pi}{h}} \exp\{ip(x - y)\} \exp\{\Psi^h(p)(T - t)\} dp.$$

Proof. Note that: $P(X_T^h = y | X_t^h = x) = (e^{(T-t)L^h} \mathbb{1}_{\{y\}})(x)$. Thus (5) follows directly from the relation $\mathcal{F}_h L^h \mathcal{F}_h^{-1} = \Psi^h$. (where Ψ^h is the operator that multiplies functions point-wise by Ψ^h). $\square$

In what follows we study the convergence of (4) to (5) as $h \downarrow 0$. These expressions are particularly suited to such an analysis, not least of all because the spatial and temporal components are nicely separated and homogeneous.

One also checks that for every $t \geq 0$:

$$\phi_{X_t^h}(p) = \mathbb{E}[e^{ipX_t^h}] = \exp\{t\Psi^h(p)\}$$

(hence X^h are compound Poisson processes [14, p. 18, Definition 4.2]).

3.2. Convergence of the characteristic exponents. We introduce for $p \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$f_h(p) := \frac{\cos(hp) - 1}{h^2} + \frac{p^2}{2}$$

and, under scheme 1:

$$\begin{aligned} g_h(p) &:= i \left(\frac{\sin(hp)}{h} - p \right) \\ l_h(p) &:= c_0^h \frac{\cos(hp) - 1}{h^2} - \mu^h i \frac{\sin(hp)}{h} + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-V, V]}(u)) d\lambda(u). \end{aligned}$$

respectively, under scheme 2:

$$\begin{aligned} g_h(p) &:= \frac{e^{ihp} - 1}{h} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(\mu - \mu^h) + \frac{1 - e^{-ihp}}{h} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,0]}(\mu - \mu^h) - ip; \\ l_h(p) &:= c_0^h \frac{\cos(hp) - 1}{h^2} - \mu^h \left[\frac{e^{ihp} - 1}{h} \mathbb{1}_{[0,\infty)}(\mu - \mu^h) + \frac{1 - e^{-ihp}}{h} \mathbb{1}_{(-\infty,0]}(\mu - \mu^h) \right] + \\ &\quad + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h \left(e^{i(s+\text{sgn}(s)h)p} - 1 \right) - \int_{\mathbb{R}} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-V,V]}(u)) d\lambda(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus:

$$\Psi^h - \Psi =: \sigma^2 f_h + \mu g_h + l_h.$$

Next, two elementary but key lemmas. The first (its proof, which relies on the Taylor expansion at 0 and the Mean Value Theorem, is left to the reader) concerns some elementary trigonometric inequalities as well as the Lipschitz difference for the remainder of the exponential series $f_l(x) := \sum_{k=l+1}^{\infty} \frac{(ix)^k}{k!}$ ($x \in \mathbb{R}$, $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$). These estimates will be used again and again in what follows. The second lemma establishes key convergence properties relating to λ and is proved below.

Lemma 9. *For all real x : $0 \leq \cos(x) - 1 + \frac{x^2}{2} \leq \frac{x^4}{4!}$, $0 \leq \text{sgn}(x)(x - \sin(x)) \leq \text{sgn}(x) \frac{x^3}{3!}$ and $0 \leq x^2 + 2(1 - \cos(x)) - 2x \sin(x) \leq x^4/4$. Whenever $\{x, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ we have (with $\delta := y - x$):*

- (1) $|e^{ix} - e^{iy}|^2 = |e^{ix} - 1 - (e^{iy} - 1)|^2 \leq \delta^2$.
- (2) $|e^{ix} - 1 - ix - (e^{iy} - 1 - iy)|^2 \leq \delta^4/4 + \delta^2 x^2 + |\delta|^3 |x|$.
- (3) $|e^{ix} - 1 - ix + x^2/2 - (e^{iy} - 1 - iy + y^2/2)|^2 \leq \delta^6/36 + |\delta|^5 |x|/6 + (5/12)\delta^4 x^2 + |\delta|^3 |x|^3/2 + \delta^2 x^4/4$.

Moreover, for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, one has $|f_l(x) - f_l(y)| \leq (\sqrt{2})^{l^2} |\delta|(|x|^l + |\delta|^l)$.

Lemma 10. *For any Lévy measure λ one has for the two functions (given for $1 \geq \delta > 0$): $M_0(\delta) := \delta^2 \int_{[-1,1] \setminus (-\delta,\delta)} d\lambda(x)$ and $M_1(\delta) := \delta \int_{[-1,1] \setminus (-\delta,\delta)} |x| d\lambda(x)$ that $M_0(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ and $M_1(\delta) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. If, moreover, $\int_{[-1,1]} |x| d\lambda(x) < \infty$, then $\delta \int_{[-1,1] \setminus (-\delta,\delta)} d\lambda(x) \rightarrow 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$.*

Proof. Indeed let μ be the finite measure on $([-1,1], \mathcal{B}_{[-1,1]})$ given by $\mu(A) := \int_A x^2 d\lambda(x)$ (A Borel subset of $[-1,1]$) and let $f_\delta^0(x) := \left(\frac{\delta}{x}\right)^2 \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1] \setminus (-\delta,\delta)}(x)$ and $f_\delta^1(x) := \frac{\delta}{|x|} \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1] \setminus (-\delta,\delta)}(x)$ be functions on $[-1,1]$. Clearly $0 \leq f_\delta^0, f_\delta^1 \leq 1$ and $f_\delta^0, f_\delta^1 \rightarrow 0$ pointwise as $\delta \downarrow 0$. Hence by Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem (DCT), we have $M_0(\delta) = \int f_\delta^0 d\mu$ and $M_1(\delta) = \int f_\delta^1 d\mu$ converging to $\int 0 d\mu = 0$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. The “finite first moment” case is similar. $\square$

Proposition 11. *Under scheme 1, with $\sigma^2 > 0$, (2) holds for all sufficiently small h .*

Proof. If $V = 0$ this is immediate. If $V = 1$, then (via a triangle inequality)

$$\begin{aligned} h|\mu^h| &\leq h \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} s \int_{A_s^h} \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1]}(y) d\lambda(y) \right| \leq h \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^h} |s - u + u| \mathbb{1}_{[-1,1]}(y) d\lambda(y) \\ &\leq h \left(\frac{h}{2} \lambda([-1,1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \int_{[-1,1] \setminus [h/2, h/2]} |u| d\lambda(u) \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $h \downarrow 0$ by Lemma 10. Eventually the expression is smaller than $\sigma^2 > 0$ and the claim follows. $\square$

Furthermore, we have the following inequalities, which together imply an estimate for $|\Psi^h - \Psi|$. For ease of notation in this proposition and the proofs to come, we introduce the notation ($\delta \in (0, 1]$): $\zeta(\delta) := \delta \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\delta, \delta]} |x| d\lambda(x)$, $\gamma(\delta) := \delta^2 \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\delta, \delta]} d\lambda(x)$, $c := \lambda(\mathbb{R})$, $b := \kappa(0)$, $d := \lambda(\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1])$. Recall also the definition of the sets A_s^h following (1).

Proposition 12 (Convergence of characteristic exponents). *For all $p \in \mathbb{R}$: $0 \leq f_h(p) \leq p^4 h^2 / 4!$ and $0 \leq \text{isgn}(p) g_h(p) \leq h^2 |p|^3 / 3!$ (resp., under scheme 2, $|g_h(p)| \leq h p^2 / 2!$). Moreover:*

- (i) *when $c < \infty$; with $\delta^0 = V = 0$: $|l_h(p)| \leq c|p|h/2$ (resp. under scheme 2, $|l_h(p)| \leq c|p|^{3h/2}$).*
- (ii) *when $b < \infty = c$; with $\delta^0 = 0$ and $V = 1$; for all $h \leq 2$: $|l_h(p)| \leq \frac{h}{2} (|p|d + p^2 b) + (p^2 + |p|^3) o(h)$ (resp. under scheme 2, $|l_h(p)| \leq \frac{3h}{2} (|p|d + \frac{4}{3} p^2 b) + (p^2 + |p|^3 + p^4) o(h)$) where $o(h)$ depends only on λ .*
- (iii) *when $b = \infty$; with $\delta^0 = V = 1$; for all $h \leq 2$: $|l_h(p)| \leq p^2 (\zeta(h/2) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma(h/2)) + (|p| + p^2 + |p|^3 + p^4) O(h)$ (resp. under scheme 2, $|l_h(p)| \leq p^2 [4\zeta(h/2) + \frac{15}{2} \gamma(h/2)] + (|p| + p^2 + |p|^3 + p^4) O(h)$) and $O(h)$ depends only on λ . Note here that we always have $\gamma \leq \zeta$ and that ζ decays strictly slower than h , as $h \downarrow 0$.*

Proof. The first two assertions are transparent by Lemma 9 — with the exception of the estimate under scheme 2, where (with $\delta := hp$):

$$|g_h(p)| = \frac{1}{h} \sqrt{\delta^2 - 2\delta \sin(\delta) + 2(1 - \cos(\delta))} \leq \frac{1}{h} \frac{\delta^2}{2} = h p^2 / 2!.$$

For the final set of inequalities, the transposition of the estimates under scheme 1 to the ones under scheme 2 is essentially straightforward. Notable differences are given paranthetically in square brackets.

If $c < \infty$ (under $\delta^0 = V = 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1) - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1) d\lambda(u) \right| &= \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h e^{isp} - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} e^{ipu} d\lambda(u) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^h} (e^{isp} - e^{ipu}) d\lambda(u) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^h} |1 - e^{ip(u-s)}| d\lambda(u) \leq |p|h\lambda\left(\mathbb{R} \setminus \left[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}\right]\right) / 2 \end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we apply Lemma 9 and the first follows from the triangle inequalities. Finally $|\int_{[-h/2, h/2]} (e^{ipu} - 1) d\lambda(u)| \leq \lambda([-h/2, h/2])|p|h/2$ and the claim obtains. The reader will have no trouble reassuring himself that, under scheme 2, one obtains the bound as given.

If $b < \infty = c$ (under $\delta^0 = 0$ and $V = 1$; for all $h \leq 2$), denoting $\eta(\delta) := \int_{[-\delta, \delta]} |x| d\lambda(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u)) d\lambda(u) \right| &\leq \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (\cos(pu) - 1) d\lambda(u) \right| + \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (\sin(pu) - pu) d\lambda(u) \right| \\ (9) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq \frac{1}{4} p^2 h \eta(h/2) + \frac{1}{4 \cdot 3!} |p|^3 h^2 \eta(h/2). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mu^h g_h(p)| &= \left| \mu^h \left(\frac{\sin(hp)}{h} - p \right) \right| \leq h^2 |\mu^h| |p|^3 / 3! \\
(10) \quad &\leq \frac{1}{3!} h^2 |p|^3 \left(\frac{h}{2} \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1) - ip\mu^h - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u)) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^h} \left| e^{ipu} - e^{ips} - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u) + ips \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u) \right| d\lambda(u) \\
&\leq \frac{h}{2} |p| \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1]} d\lambda(u) + p^2 \frac{h}{2} \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) + \frac{5}{8} \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^2 p^2 \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} d\lambda(u) \\
(11) \quad &\leq \frac{h}{2} |p| d + \frac{h}{2} p^2 b + \frac{5}{8} \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^2 p^2 \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} d\lambda(u)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have considered the area inside and outside of $[-1, 1]$ separately. Inside it we use the following estimate which follows from Lemma 9 (whenever $\{x, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $\delta := y - x$, $0 \neq |x| \geq |\delta|$):

$$(12) \quad |e^{ix} - ix - e^{iy} + iy| \leq |\delta x| \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{\delta}{x} \right| + \frac{1}{8} \frac{\delta^2}{x^2} \right) = |\delta x| + \frac{1}{2} \delta^2 + \frac{1}{8} \left| \frac{\delta^3}{x} \right| \leq |\delta x| + \frac{5}{8} \delta^2$$

and here the first inequality uses $\sqrt{1+z} \leq 1 + z/2$ in turn ($z \geq 0$). We apply (12) to $x = pu$, $y = ps$ in order to estimate the difference inside $[-1, 1]$ in (11).

Now, combining (9), (10) and 11, the desired claim follows, at least under scheme 1.

[Under scheme 2, (9) remains unaltered. (10) becomes:

$$(13) \quad |\mu^h g_h(p)| \leq \frac{h}{2} p^2 \left(\frac{3h}{2} \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) \right).$$

Finally in the estimate (11) we apply (12) to $x = up$ and $y = p(s + h \operatorname{sgn}(s))$ so that we only have $|x| \geq \frac{1}{3} \delta$ and hence $|e^{ix} - ix - e^{iy} + iy| \leq \delta |x| + \frac{7}{8} \delta^2$ — (11) now reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{i(s+h \operatorname{sgn}(s))p} - 1) - ip\mu^h - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-h/2, h/2]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u)) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
(14) \quad &\leq \frac{3h}{2} |p| d + \frac{3h}{2} p^2 b + \frac{7}{8} \left(\frac{3h}{2} \right)^2 p^2 \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]} d\lambda(u).
\end{aligned}$$

By combining (9), (13) and (14) the result follows also under scheme 2.]

Finally, if $b = \infty$ (under $\delta^0 = V = 1$; for all $h \leq 2$), denoting $\xi(\delta) := \int_{[-\delta, \delta]} x^2 d\lambda(x)$:

$$(15) \quad \left| c_0^h \left(\frac{\cos(hp)}{h^2} + \frac{p^2}{2} \right) \right| \leq p^4 h^2 \xi(h/2) / 4!.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} u^2 \left(-\frac{p^2}{2} \right) d\lambda(u) - \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
& \leq \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} \left(\cos(pu) - 1 + \frac{p^2 u^2}{2!} \right) d\lambda(u) \right| + \left| \int_{[-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (\sin(pu) - pu) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
(16) \quad & \leq p^4 (h/2)^2 \xi(h/2)/4! + |p|^3 (h/2) \xi(h/2)/3!.
\end{aligned}$$

$$(17) \quad |\mu^h g_h(p)| = \left| \mu^h \left(\frac{\sin(hp)}{h} - p \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{3!} h^2 |p|^3 \left(\frac{h}{2} \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) \right).$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1) - ip\mu^h - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u)) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^h} \left| e^{ipu} - e^{ips} - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u) + ips \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u) \right| d\lambda(u) \\
(18) \quad & \leq \frac{h}{2} |p| \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1]} d\lambda(u) + p^2 \frac{h}{2} \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) + p^2 \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{2} \right)^2 \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \frac{7}{6} \frac{h}{2} \xi(h/2)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second inequality we have now made the following estimate (whenever $\{x, y\} \subset \mathbb{R}$, with $\delta := y - x$, $0 \neq |x| \geq |\delta|$):

$$(19) \quad |e^{ix} - e^{iy} - ix + iy| \leq |e^{ix} - e^{iy} - ix + iy + x^2/2 - y^2/2| + \frac{1}{2} |x^2 - y^2| \leq \frac{7}{6} |\delta| x^2 + |\delta| |x| + \frac{1}{2} \delta^2$$

using Lemma 9. We apply (19) to $x = pu$, $y = ps$.

[Under scheme 2, (15) and (16) remain unchanged and (17) reads:

$$(20) \quad |\mu^h g_h(p)| \leq \frac{h}{2} p^2 \left(\frac{3h}{2} \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} |u| d\lambda(u) \right).$$

Finally, in place of (18) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}} c_s^h (e^{isp} - 1) - ip\mu^h - \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-\frac{h}{2}, \frac{h}{2}]} (e^{ipu} - 1 - ipu \mathbb{1}_{[-1, 1]}(u)) d\lambda(u) \right| \\
(21) \quad & \leq \frac{3h}{2} |p| \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus [-1, 1]} d\lambda(u) + p^2 \frac{3h}{2} \int_{[-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]} |u| d\lambda(u) + p^2 \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{3h}{2} \right)^2 \lambda([-1, 1] \setminus [-h/2, h/2]) + A \frac{3h}{2} \xi(h/2)
\end{aligned}$$

where A is some positive constant whose precise value is not important.] Now, combining (15), (16), (17) and (18) under scheme 1 (resp. (15), (16), (20) and (21) under scheme 2) yields the desired inequality. $\square$

The above entails convergence of $\Psi^h(p)$ to $\Psi(p)$ as $h \downarrow 0$ pointwise in $p \in \mathbb{R}$. Lévy's continuity theorem [6, p. 326] and stationarity and independence of increments yield at once Remark 3.

4. RATES OF CONVERGENCE FOR TRANSITION KERNELS

Finally let us incorporate the estimates of Proposition 12 into an estimate of $D_{t,T}^h(x, y)$ (recall the notation in (6)). Assumption 1 and Table 1 are understood as being in effect throughout from this point onwards. Recall that $|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq \sigma^2 |f_h| + \mu |g_h| + |l_h|$.

We assume given a function K with the properties: $0 \leq K(h) \uparrow \infty$ as $h \downarrow 0$ and $K(h) \leq \frac{\pi}{h}$ for all sufficiently small h (this condition will always be easily checked and suitable choices of K will be identified later). Divide the integration regions in (4) and (5) into five parts: $(-\infty, -\frac{\pi}{h}]$, $(-\frac{\pi}{h}, -K(h))$, $[-K(h), K(h)]$, $(K(h), \frac{\pi}{h})$, $[\frac{\pi}{h}, \infty)$. Separate (via a triangle inequality) the integrals in the difference $D_{t,T}^h(x, y)$ accordingly and use the triangle inequality in the second and fourth region, thus (we let $s := T - t > 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi D_{t,T}^h(x, y) &\leq \left[\int_{-\infty}^{-\pi/h} + \int_{\pi/h}^{\infty} \right] |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| dp + \left[\int_{-\pi/h}^{-K(h)} + \int_{K(h)}^{\pi/h} \right] \left(|\exp\{\Psi^h(p)s\}| + |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| \right) dp + \\ &\quad + \int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\} - \exp\{\Psi^h(p)s\}| dp. \end{aligned}$$

Now gather the terms with $|\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}|$ in the integrand and use $|e^z - 1| \leq e^{|z|} - 1$ ($z \in \mathbb{C}$) to estimate the integral over $[-K(h), K(h)]$, to arrive at:

$$(22) \quad 2\pi D_{t,T}^h(x, y) \leq \left[\int_{-\infty}^{-K(h)} + \int_{K(h)}^{\infty} \right] |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| dp +$$

$$(23) \quad + \left[\int_{-\pi/h}^{-K(h)} + \int_{K(h)}^{\pi/h} \right] |\exp\{\Psi^h(p)s\}| dp +$$

$$(24) \quad + \int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| \left(\exp\{s|\Psi^h(p) - \Psi(p)|\} - 1 \right) dp.$$

For convenience we let (22), resp. (23) and (24) stand for the first, resp. second and third term on the RHS of the above inequality. We deal with each of them separately; the first two will always die off quickly, governed by the rapid decay of the exponential function. By a suitable choice of $K(h)$ we shall be able to achieve $\sup_{[-K(h), K(h)]} |\Psi^h - \Psi| \rightarrow 0$ as $h \downarrow 0$, while still maintaining sufficient decay in the other terms. Then for all sufficiently small h , $s|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq 1$ everywhere on $[-K(h), K(h)]$. Write:

$$e^{s|\Psi^h - \Psi|} - 1 = s|\Psi^h - \Psi| + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{(s|\Psi^h - \Psi|)^k}{k!} \leq s|\Psi^h - \Psi| + (s|\Psi^h - \Psi|)^2 e^{s|\Psi^h - \Psi|} \leq s|\Psi^h - \Psi| + e(s|\Psi^h - \Psi|)^2.$$

Manifestly the second term will always decay strictly faster than the first (so long as they are not 0). We shall use this estimate repeatedly in what follows.

Suppose first $\sigma^2 > 0$. We have then $|\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 sp^2\}$ everywhere in $p \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$|\exp\{\Psi^h(p)s\}| = \exp\left\{ \sigma^2 s \frac{\cos(hp) - 1}{h^2} \right\} \leq \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 s \alpha p^2 \right\},$$

the latter inequality holding for all $p \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}]$ and some $\alpha > 0$. Now, with this estimate as the integrand, extend integration in (23) to infinity (i.e. to the whole of $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-K(h), K(h))$).

Similarly, when $\sigma^2 = 0$, then, as in Remark 4, for some $C > 0$ and all large enough p , $|\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| \leq \exp\{-Cs|p|^\epsilon\}$. Also, the real part of $\Psi^h(p)$ is majorized on $[-\frac{\pi}{h}, -K(h)] \cup [K(h), \frac{\pi}{h}]$ by (for some $\beta > 0$):

$$\begin{aligned}
(25) \quad & - \left[c_0^h + \sum_{s \in \mathbb{Z}_h \setminus \{0\}, |s|+h \leq \frac{7\pi}{4|p|}} c_s^h (s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h)^2 \right] \frac{1}{2} \beta p^2 \leq -\frac{1}{2} \beta p^2 \int_{[-\frac{7\pi}{4|p|} + \frac{3h}{2}, \frac{7\pi}{4|p|} - \frac{3h}{2}]} u^2 d\lambda(u) \\
& \leq -\frac{1}{2} \beta p^2 \int_{[-\frac{\pi}{4|p|}, \frac{\pi}{4|p|}]} u^2 d\lambda(u) \leq -\frac{1}{2} \beta A p^2 \left(\frac{\pi}{4|p|} \right)^{2-\epsilon} \leq -C' |p|^\epsilon
\end{aligned}$$

for some $C \geq C' > 0$, where we have taken into account that for all small enough h , we will have $K(h)$ large enough, so that $\frac{\pi}{4|p|}$ is small enough for the limit inferior in Assumption 1 to produce $A > 0$ (if $2A$ is the limit inferior under question, then there exists some $\delta > 0$, such that for all $0 \leq r < \delta$, $\int_{[-r, r]} u^2 d\lambda(u) \geq A r^{2-\epsilon}$). Hence $|\exp\{\Psi^h(p)s\}| \leq \exp\{-C'|p|^\epsilon\}$ the latter for all $p \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, -K(h)] \cup [K(h), \frac{\pi}{h}]$. It follows that, with this estimate as the integrand, we can safely extend the integral in (23) to infinity (i.e. to the whole of $\mathbb{R} \setminus (-K(h), K(h))$).

The rest of the analysis relies heavily on the choice of $K(h)$ in each particular instance. In the interest of clarity, we shall therefore deal with the individual cases one by one. What follows is summarized by Theorem 2.

Notation-wise we let DCT stand for Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem.

4.1. Brownian motion with drift: $\sigma^2 > 0$, $\lambda(\mathbb{R}) = 0$. Let $K(h) := \sqrt{\frac{2.3}{\sigma^2 s \alpha} \log \frac{1}{h}}$. It is then manifest that (22) and (23) will be $O(h^3)$. As for (24), notice that $K(h)^n h^m \rightarrow 0$ as $h \downarrow 0$, whenever $\{m, n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$. Hence for all sufficiently small h , we have $s|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq 1$ everywhere on $[-K(h), K(h)]$. Using the inequality $e^{s|\Psi^h - \Psi|} - 1 \leq s|\Psi^h - \Psi| + e(s|\Psi^h - \Psi|)^2$, the second term contributes a term which is $O(h^4)$ to (24), since $\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 s p^2\} dp$ integrates every polynomial in p absolutely (use the estimates of Proposition 12). Finally we have:

$$\int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| |\Psi^h(p) - \Psi(p)| s dp \leq h^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 s p^2\} s \left(|\mu| \frac{|p|^3}{3!} + \sigma^2 \frac{p^4}{4!} \right) dp.$$

Performing the integration we arrive at (26) of:

Proposition 13. *When $\sigma^2 > 0$ and $c = 0$, we have for all sufficiently small h (depending on μ , σ^2 and s):*

$$(26) \quad \Delta_s(h) \leq h^2 \left[\frac{1}{3\pi} \frac{|\mu|}{\sigma^4 s} + \frac{1}{8\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1}{(s\sigma^2)^{3/2}} \right] + O(h^3).$$

Hence $\Delta_s(h) = O(h^2)$. With $\sigma^2 s = 1$ and $\mu = 0$ we have $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \Delta_s(h)/h^2 \geq 1/(8\sqrt{2\pi})$, proving that in general the convergence rate is no better than quadratic.

Proof. It remains for us to establish the last assertion. Take $x = y = 0$. Notice that if one can write $D_{t,T}^h(0,0) \geq A(h) - B(h)$ with $\lim_{h \downarrow 0} B(h)/h^2 = 0$, then it is sufficient to maintain

$\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} A(h)/h^2 \geq 1/(8\sqrt{2\pi})$. Careful analysis of our estimates shows that we can take:

$$A(h) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2\right\} f_h(p) dp \right|.$$

By DCT, we have $A(h)/h^2 \rightarrow \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2\} p^4/4! dp$ and the claim follows. $\square$

Remark 14 (RD). *In general, suppose we seek to prove that $f \geq 0$ converges to 0 no faster than $g > 0$, i.e. that $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} f(h)/g(h) \geq C > 0$ for some C . If one can show $f(h) \geq A(h) - B(h)$ and $B = o(g)$, then to show $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} f(h)/g(h) \geq C$, it is sufficient to establish $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} A(h)/g(h) \geq C$. We refer to this extremely useful principle as reduction by domination (henceforth RD).*

4.2. Compound Poisson process with diffusion: $\sigma^2 > 0$, $0 < \lambda(\mathbb{R}) < \infty$. Let $K(h) := \sqrt{\frac{2.2}{\sigma^2 s \alpha} \log \frac{1}{h}}$. It is then manifest that (22) and (23) will be $O(h^2)$. Finally for (24), following a similar argument to that in the previous case, apart from a term which is $O(h^2)$ we have:

$$\int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} |\exp\{\Psi(p)s\}| |l_h(p)| s dp \leq \frac{hcs}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 sp^2\right\} |p| dp.$$

Performing the integration we arrive at (27) of:

Proposition 15. *When $\sigma^2 > 0$ and $0 < c < \infty$, we have for all sufficiently small h (depending on μ , σ^2 , s and c):*

$$(27) \quad \Delta_s(h) \leq h \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{c}{\sigma^2} + O(h^2).$$

Hence $\Delta_s(h) = O(h)$. With $\sigma^2 = s = 1$, $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{1/2} + \delta_{-1/2})$ one has $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \Delta_s(h)/h > 0$ showing that convergence in general is indeed no better than linear.

Proof. With regard to the last assertion, via RD by a careful analysis of our estimates (again considering $x = y = 0$), one need only observe for the sequence $h_n = \frac{1}{3^n} \downarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ the lim sup as $n \rightarrow \infty$ of $\frac{1}{2\pi h_n} \left| \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 - 1 + \cos(p/2)\right\} l_{h_n}(p) dp \right|$. By our careful choice of λ and then h_n it is clear that $l_{h_n}(p) = 2\frac{1}{2}\Re(e^{ip(1/2-h_n/2)} - e^{ip/2}) = \cos(p/2)(\cos(ph_n/2) - 1) + \sin(p/2)\sin(ph_n/2)$. It is therefore sufficient to observe:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2\pi h_n} \left| \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 - 1 + \cos(p/2)\right\} \sin(ph_n/2) \sin(p/2) dp \right|.$$

By DCT it is equal to:

$$I := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\infty p \sin(p/2) \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 - 1 + \cos(p/2)\right\} dp.$$

The numerical value of this integral is (to one decimal place in units of 2π) $0.4/(2\pi)$, but we can show that $I > 0$ analytically. Indeed the integrand is positive on $[0, 6]$. Hence $eI \geq \sin(1/2)e^{\cos(3/2)} \int_1^3 pe^{-p^2/2} dp - e \int_6^\infty pe^{-p^2/2} dp = \sin(1/2)e^{\cos(3/2)}[e^{-1/2} - e^{-9/2}] - e^{-17}$. Now use $\sin(1/2) \geq (1/2) \cdot (2/\pi)$ (which follows from the concavity of $\sin$ on $[0, \pi/2]$), so that, very

crudely: $I \geq (1/\pi)e^{-1/2}(1 - e^{-4}) - e^{-17} \geq (1/\pi)e^{-1/2}(1/2) - e^{-17} \geq (1/e^2)e^{-1/2}(1/e) - e^{-17} \geq e^{-4} - e^{-17} > 0$. $\square$

4.3. $\sigma^2 > 0$, $\kappa(0) < \infty = \lambda(\mathbb{R})$. Let $K(h) := \sqrt{\frac{2 \cdot 2}{\sigma^2 s \alpha} \log \frac{1}{h}}$. (22) and (23) are then $O(h^2)$. As for (24), modulo a term which is $o(h)$ (following the discussion above) we have it bounded by:

$$\frac{hs}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 s p^2\} (d|p| + b p^2) dp.$$

Hence (28) of:

Proposition 16. *When $\sigma^2 > 0$, and $b < \infty = c$, we have for all sufficiently small h (depending on μ, σ^2, s, d and b):*

$$(28) \quad \Delta_s(h) \leq h \left[\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d}{\sigma^2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{bs}{(\sigma^2 s)^{3/2}} \right] + o(h).$$

In general convergence is no better than linear.

Proof. To show the validity of the final remark, we can for the most part recycle the example from the previous subsection. Indeed just take $x = y = 0$, $h_n = 1/3^n$, $\sigma^2 = s = 1$, $\mu = 0$ and

$$\lambda = \frac{1}{2}(\delta_{3/2} + \delta_{-3/2}) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\delta_{1/3^k} + \delta_{-1/3^k}).$$

Because the second term in λ lives on $\cup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_{h_n}$ it is seen quickly (via RD) that one need only consider (to within non-zero multiplicative constants):

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \frac{1}{h_n} \sin(ph_n/2) \sin(3p/2) \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 + (\cos(3p/2) - 1) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\cos(p/3^k) - 1)\} dp.$$

By DCT it is sufficient to observe that:

$$\int_0^{2\pi/3} \sin(3p/2) p \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2 + (\cos(3p/2) - 1) - \frac{p^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{9^k}\} dp - \int_{2\pi/3}^{\infty} p \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}p^2\} dp > 0.$$

To see the latter, note that the second integral is immediate and equal to: $e^{-1/2(2\pi/3)^2}$. As for the first one, make the change of variables $u = 3p/2$. Thus we need to establish that:

$$A := (4/(9e)) \int_0^{\pi} \sin(u) u \exp\{-u^2/4 + \cos(u)\} du - e^{-1/2(2\pi/3)^2} > 0.$$

Next note that $-u^2/4 + \cos(u)$ is decreasing on $[0, \pi]$ and the integrand in A is positive. It follows that

$$A \geq \frac{4}{9e} \left[\int_0^{\pi/3} u \sin(u) \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)^2 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{3}\right)\right\} du + \int_{\pi/3}^{\pi/2} u \sin(u) \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^2 + \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)\right\} du \right] - e^{-2\pi^2/9}.$$

Using integration by parts, it is now clear that this expression is algebraic over the rationals in e , $\sqrt{3}$ and the values of the exponential function at rational multiples of π^2 . Since this explicit expression can be estimated from below by a positive quantity, one can check that $A > 0$. $\square$

4.4. $\sigma^2 > 0$, $\kappa(0) = \infty$. With regard to the choice of $K(h)$ we have to be a bit more careful here: $K(h) := \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(h/2)}\right)^{1/4}$. Then (22) and (23) will decay strictly faster than $\zeta(h/2)$ while at the same time we still have $s|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq 1$ everywhere on $[-K(h), K(h)]$ for all sufficiently small h . Thus all our other considerations remain the same and we have (22) bounded from above for all sufficiently small h and modulo a term which is $o(\zeta(h/2))$, by:

$$s \left(\zeta(h/2) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma(h/2) \right) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 s p^2\right\} p^2 dp.$$

Proposition 17. *When $\sigma^2 > 0$, $b = \infty$, we have for all sufficiently small h (depending on the characteristic triplet and s):*

$$(29) \quad \Delta_s(h) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{s}{(\sigma^2 s)^{3/2}} \left(\zeta(h/2) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma(h/2) \right) + o(\zeta(h/2)).$$

In general the convergence is no better than $\zeta(h/2)$.

Proof. To show that convergence is no better than $\zeta(h/2)$ in general, consider again $x = y = 0$, $\sigma^2 = s = 1$, $\mu = 0$, $h_n = 1/3^n$ and $\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(\delta_{x_k} + \delta_{-x_k})$ where $x_n = \frac{3}{2}h_n$ and $w_n = 1/x_n$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). Notice that $\sigma_1 := \int_{[-1,1] \setminus [-h_n/2, h_n/2]} u^2 d\lambda(u) = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n x_k^2 w_k$ and $\sigma_2 := \sum_{s \in S_{h_n} \setminus \{0\}} c_s^{h_n} s^2 = 2 \sum_{k=1}^n (x_k - \frac{h_n}{2})^2 w_k$ and $\Delta := \sigma_1 - \sigma_2 = 2\zeta(h_n/2) - \gamma(h_n/2) \geq \zeta(h_n/2)$. It is sufficient to show then, that $\int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} p^2 \exp\{\Psi(p)\} dp$ converges to a strictly positive value as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which is transparent (since Ψ is real valued). $\square$

4.5. $\sigma^2 = 0$, $\kappa(0) < \infty = \lambda(\mathbb{R})$. Taking $K(h) := \sqrt{\frac{2.2}{C'}} \log \frac{1}{h}$ we see that (22) and (23) will be $O(h^2)$. Finally we have (24). Note that on account of our choice of K , we will yet again have $s|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq 1$ everywhere on $[-K(h), K(h)]$ for all small enough h . Hence, as usual, we arrive at the first assertion of:

Proposition 18. *When $\sigma^2 = 0$ and $b < \infty = c$ we have $\Delta_s(h) = O(h)$. In general convergence is no better than linear.*

Proof. To establish convergence is no better than linear in general, take $s = 1$, $x = y = 0$, $\mu = 0$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(\delta_{x_k} + \delta_{-x_k})$, where $x_n = h_n = 1/2^n$ and $w_n = 2^{n/2}$ ($n \in \mathbb{N}$). By checking Orey's condition on the decreasing sequence h_n , Assumption 1 is satisfied with $\epsilon = 1/2$ and we have $b < \infty = c$. $\mu^h = 0$ by symmetry.

Going through our estimates and using RD, we need only show that $\limsup_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \left| \int_{-K(h)}^{K(h)} \exp\{\Psi(p)\} (\Psi^h(p) - \Psi(p)) dp \right| > 0$. Moreover, using the estimates of Proposition 12 and again RD, it suffices to show:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_n} \left| \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \exp\{\Psi(p)\} \left(\sum_{s \in S_{h_n} \setminus \{0\}} \int_{A_s^{h_n}} (\cos((s + \text{sgn}(s)h_n)p) - \cos(pu)) d\lambda(u) \right) dp \right| > 0.$$

Now, one can write for $s \in S_h \setminus \{0\}$ and $u \in A_s^h$,

$$\begin{aligned} \cos((s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h)p) - \cos(pu) &= \cos(pu)(\cos((s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h - u)p) - 1) \\ &\quad - \sin(pu)(\sin((s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h - u)p) - (s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h - u)p) \\ &\quad - \sin(pu)[s + \operatorname{sgn}(s)h - u]p \end{aligned}$$

and via RD get rid of the first two terms (i.e. they contribute to B rather than A in Remark 14). It follows that it is sufficient to observe:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{h_n} \left| \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \exp\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\cos(p/2^k) - 1)2^{k/2}\right\} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n 2^{k/2} \sin(p/2^k)\right) h_n p dp \right| > 0.$$

Finally, via DCT and evenness of the integrand, we need only have:

$$\int_0^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} \sin(p/2^k)\right) p \exp\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (\cos(p/2^k) - 1)2^{k/2}\right\} dp \neq 0.$$

One can in fact check that the integrand is positive, as the following lemma shows, and thus the proof is complete. $\square$

Lemma 19. *Let for $l \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and $p \geq 0$, $\psi^l(p) := \sum_{k=l}^{\infty} 2^{k/2} \sin(p/2^k)$. Then the ψ^l are all positive on $(0, \infty)$.*

Proof. Since $\psi^{l+1}(2p) = \sqrt{2}\psi^l(p)$, it is sufficient to show the claim for $\psi^0 =: \psi$. The key observation for ψ is the identity $\psi(2p) = \sin(2p) + \sqrt{2}\psi(p)$, which we use as follows.

Clearly (i) $\psi|_{(0,1]} > 0$ and (ii) for $p \in (1, 2]$ we have:

$$\psi(p) = \psi(2\frac{p}{2}) = \sin(p) + \sqrt{2}\psi(p/2) \geq \sin(1) + \sqrt{2}\psi(1/2) = \psi(1) > 5/2 > 1/(\sqrt{2} - 1) =: A_0,$$

since ψ is strictly increasing on $[0, 1]$, $\sin 2 > \sin 1$, $5/2 > 1/(\sqrt{2} - 1)$ and $\psi(1) > 5/2$ (see below). We now claim that if for some $B > 0$ we have $\psi|_{(0,B]} > 0$ and $\psi|_{(B,2B]} > A_0$, then $\psi|_{(0,2B]} > 0$ and $\psi|_{(2B,4B]} > A_0$, and hence the assertion of the lemma will follow at once (by applying the latter first to $B = 1$, then $B = 2$ and so on). So let $2p \in (2B, 4B]$, i.e. $p \in (B, 2B]$. Then $\psi(2p) = \sin(2p) + \sqrt{2}\psi(p) > -1 + \sqrt{2}/(\sqrt{2} - 1) = 1/(\sqrt{2} - 1)$, as required.

As a technical aside we should verify the slightly non-trivial observation $\psi(1) > 5/2$. Indeed, $\psi(1)$ is, by definition, a series of positive terms. Hence, by using $\sin(1/2^k) \geq \sin(1)/2^k$ for $k \geq 0$, $\psi(1) \geq \sin(1) + \sin(1) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2^{-k/2} = \sin(1)[1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}-1}]$. Next, the series expansion of $\sin$ around 0 and the properties of alternating series yield $\sin(1) \geq 1 - 1/6 + 1/5! - 1/5! = 5/6$. Thus $\psi(1) \geq \frac{5}{6}[1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}-1}] > 5/2$, as is easily verified. $\square$

4.6. $\sigma^2 = 0$, $\kappa(0) = \infty$. Take $K(h) := \left(\frac{1}{\zeta(h/2)}\right)^{1/4}$. Then (22) and (23) decay strictly faster than $\zeta(h/2)$. As for (24), we still have $s|\Psi^h - \Psi| \leq 1$ everywhere on $[-K(h), K(h)]$ for all small enough h . Hence the first assertion of:

Proposition 20. *When $\sigma^2 = 0$, $b = \infty$, we have $\Delta_s(h) = O(\zeta(h/2))$. In general, convergence is no better than $\zeta(h/2)$.*

Proof. To establish the second assertion, take $s = 1$, $x = y = 0$, $\mu = 0$, $h_k = x_k = 1/2^k$, $w_k = 1/x_k$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}$) and $\lambda = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_k(\delta_{x_k} + \delta_{-x_k})$. Checking Orey's condition on the decreasing sequence x_k , Assumption 1 obtains at once with $\epsilon = 1$. Observe that $\mu^h = 0$ and Ψ is real valued.

By a careful analysis of our estimates, using RD, it is sufficient to observe that:

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \int_{-K(h_n)}^{K(h_n)} \frac{p^2 \exp\{\Psi(p)\}}{2\zeta(h_n/2)} \left[\sum_{s \in S_{h_n} \setminus \{0\}} c_s^{h_n}(s + h_n \operatorname{sgn}(s))^2 - \int_{[-1,1] \setminus [-\frac{h_n}{2}, \frac{h_n}{2}]} u^2 d\lambda(u) \right] dp \right| > 0.$$

Direct calculation yields the expression in the square brackets as being equal to:

$$\sum_{k=1}^n (x_k + h_n)^2 w_k - \sum_{k=1}^n x_k^2 w_k = 2h_n \sum_{k=1}^n x_k w_k + h_n^2 \sum_{k=1}^n w_k = 2(\zeta(h_n/2) + \gamma(h_n/2)).$$

Hence it is sufficient to observe that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p^2 \exp\{\Psi(p)\} dp > 0$ and this follows, since Ψ is real-valued. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. Vlad Bally and Denis Talay. The Law of the Euler Scheme for Stochastic Differential Equations: II. Convergence Rate of the Density. *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*, 2, 2009.
2. J. Bertoin. *Lévy Processes*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
3. Björn Böttcher and René L. Schilling. Approximation of Feller processes by Markov chains with Lévy increments. *Stochastics and Dynamics*, 9(1):71–80, 2009.
4. Peter P. Carr, Hélène Geman, Dilip B. Madan, and Marc Yor. The fine structure of asset returns: an empirical investigation. *Journal of Business*, 75(2):305–332, 2002.
5. John Crosby, Nolwenn Le Saux, and Aleksandar Mijatović. Approximating Lévy processes with a view to option pricing. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 13, 2010.
6. R. M. Dudley. *Real Analysis and Probability*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.
7. Paul Glasserman. *Monte Carlo Methods in Financial Engineering (Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability) (v. 53)*. Springer, 1 edition, August 2003.
8. Jonas Kiessling and Raúl Tempone. Diffusion approximation of Lévy processes with a view towards finance in *Monte Carlo Methods and Applications*. 17, 2011.
9. Peter E. Kloeden and Eckhard Platen. *Numerical solution of stochastic differential equations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin; New York, 1992.
10. Andreas E. Kyprianou. *Introductory Lectures on Fluctuations of Lévy Processes with Applications*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2006.
11. Aleksandar Mijatović. Spectral properties of trinomial trees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 463(2083):1681–1696, 2007.
12. James R. Norris. *Markov chains*. Cambridge series in statistical and probabilistic mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
13. Jan Rosiński. Simulation of Lévy processes in *Encyclopedia of Statistics in Quality and Reliability: Computationally Intensive Methods and Simulation*. Wiley, 2008.

14. K. I. Sato. *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
15. Alex Szimayer and Ross A. Maller. Finite approximation schemes for Lévy processes, and their application to optimal stopping problems. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 117(10):1422 – 1447, 2007.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, IMPERIAL COLLEGE LONDON, UK

E-mail address: `a.mijatovic@imperial.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, UK

E-mail address: `m.vidmar@warwick.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK, UK

E-mail address: `s.d.jacka@warwick.ac.uk`